

WASHINGTON CITY.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1886.

Business Notice.

At the business of the Union establishment, in view of the proposed change in its terms, will be conducted strictly on a cash basis, all agencies for the collection of subscriptions for the Union are discontinued. No payments should be made to agents after this date, except to Mr. W. C. Loomis, Jr., who is authorized to make collections in Baltimore, Maryland, and Virginia.

The foregoing notice is not intended to include any agents or collectors who are now employed or have heretofore been employed in this city, but those only who have performed such service in other parts of the country.

THE ARMY AND ITS SERVICES.

The favorite ground of attack upon every administration is its army expenditures. Youthful school boys learn to declaim against the danger to freedom of a Standing Army; maiden speeches in legislatures thunder with invective against military ambition; and statesmen grown gray in public debate still make of the prolific topic a theme for more than juvenile energy of declamation. When declamatory talents are wanting in the orator, the more prosy logic of facts and figures is brought into requisition and the army is every year ciphered into utter disfavor with the public.

Now, the truth is, that popular jealousy has usually proved more potent than military ambition. History has afforded a few instances of the success of military services in winning public gratitude and reward; a few also of successful military usurpation; but it recounts the cases of a vast number of generals who, having spent a life-time of service and glory, have died in neglect and penury. This has been more especially the case in popular governments, and the modern history of Great Britain, the most popular of European governments, has been signalized by instances of the readiness with which the popular branch of Parliament has been willing to turn upon and persecute its military benefactors. The incidents of the first great victory of Wellington in the Peninsular war were made the ground of parliamentary inquiry, and the greatest British general of modern times was well-nigh driven out of the service with rebuke and censure. The Duke of York, who presided over the British War Department at intervals during the long contest with Napoleon, and to whose consummate talents and bold measure the final success of England in that desperate struggle was in great part due, was at one time investigated by the House of Commons out of office, until a returning sense of popular justice demanded with acclamation his return to a post which he, more than any other in the kingdom, was most competent and most worthy to fill. The case was similar with Lord Melville, who presided over the British Navy Department, and organized its service into the efficiency which afterwards told so decidedly at Aboukir and Trafalgar, and who was nevertheless investigated out of office under the influence of popular clamor, in spite of the great exertions of Mr. Pitt to sustain him.

Among a degraded and demoralized people, military ambition and daring may sometimes succeed in erecting a despotism; but among a free people, especially of the Anglo-Saxon race, the superior power of popular jealousy over military influence has been the rule, and the reverse the exception. The ideal of all delusions is that of apprehending, in our country, serious danger to the liberties of thirty millions of people from the assaults of an army of fifteen thousand soldiers scattered over a line of posts ten thousand miles in extent! And the most droll and absurd of all misnomers is that which designates an army each regiment of which marches twelve hundred and fifty miles in the year, a *standing* army.

The ears of the people have been for so long accustomed to the *cant* which we have been alluding to, on the subject of armies and army expenditures, that the terse and strongly-written report of the Secretary of War, which we publish to-day, will be somewhat new and refreshing to them. The opening paragraphs in this paper do not more effectively put to flight this whole clamor, which is now stereotyped, against a *standing* army, by showing how continually our brave soldiers are kept on the march; than some of its other paragraphs will set at rest sundry wonderful fables that have been freely circulated by opposition newspapers during the last twelvemonth, concerning the prices paid for army supplies, and the grand total of army expenditures for the year.

Beef and cattle, it seems, have been bought for the commissariat, delivered away off in Utah and New Mexico, at cheaper rates than they were sold at, in open market, in any of our cities; and these supplies, as well as all stores purchased by the Quartermaster's Department, have been procured during the year, notwithstanding the unusual quantities required, at cheaper rates than they had before been obtained at, since the Mexican war.

As to the general expenses of the Department, the estimates for the ensuing year are nine or ten millions less than the appropriations made by Congress for the last year, and less by more than two millions than they will be for the current fiscal year. Nor is this all; for the Secretary promises by another year's effort to cut down the expenses of his department still a few millions more.

THE TARIFF—LOCAL AND INDIVIDUAL INTERESTS IN CONGRESS.

It is not much to the credit of the American people that, in view of three-quarters of a century of experience, they are unable to adjust a judicious revenue system without invoking the intervention of the spirit of party. At least the principles upon which their tariff laws should be enacted ought long ere this to have been definitively settled. It may, perhaps, be said that they have finally and forever condemned the whole doctrine of special protection; that they have decided that they will not, in adjusting a system of revenue laws, discriminate in favor of this or that branch of industry. But, after all, there is too much controversy on the subject; there are too many conflicting and partisan opinions which serve to entangle the whole matter. How is it?

The primary object which is to be attained is the collection of public revenues in aid of the government. There is not one single element of personal interest in the whole affair. It is purely a public question in theory, and if it were so in practice there would be no dispute about it. Just here is where the shoe pinches. It is found next to impossible in half the laws enacted by Congress to shut out individual interests. The public body is absolutely opaque. Every one sees into all its internal organs, and sees whatever power he possesses to become one of its engineers, to direct its action and

to secure benefits therefrom. Especially is this the case in reference to the tariff. Such laws bear directly upon the general industry of the country. They regulate, to a great extent, the whole system of exchange of products; they make and exclude markets; they open and close the very channels of trade; they say to whom the producer shall sell, and of whom he shall buy, and even determine the price in either case. It is manifest that laws of such a character must excite universal interest and a large amount of individual cupidities. They are speculative in their very nature. They cut off or restrict foreign importations, and compel the consumer to purchase of the domestic manufacturer or producer. It is, then, perfectly natural that in their enactment great individual interest should be felt and exercised; for it is the province of individuals in this country above any other to exercise more or less control over its legislation. This we can understand; but it does not explain why the subject should, in any event, assume a partisan aspect. The people of the United States want just and equal laws. If burdens are to be borne, they are ready and willing to bear them upon principles of equity and fair dealing. They are proud of their institutions and of their historical fame. Whatever is wanted for public account, in order to maintain the honor, the dignity, and the common welfare of the nation, they will give without murmur. But they will not permit their institutions to be used as an instrument of taxing one branch of industry for the benefit of another—to make Congress a legislative lobby to advance individual schemes and fortunes. To the extent that the principles of protection are advocated in that body private interests are represented, and to the same extent the legislature is prostituted and its rightful office defaced.

This evil, however, is sustained by very high authority. It has been too common to send to Congress persons avowedly elected to represent certain branches of industry, and thus to impregnate that body with antagonisms fatal to the integrity of the government and subversive of all patriotism and national unity. It may well be questioned, in view of our struggles, for instance, concerning the tariff since the adoption of the constitution, whether we have not, in this way, laid the foundation for that bitter sectional strife which now threatens the existence of the Union? It was the recognition of an interest apparently opposed to the general welfare. It was a special representation in Congress always ready to sacrifice every other object of legislation to effect its peculiar and paramount purposes. Massachusetts sent here for a long series of years, special advocates rather than constitutional representatives. Lowell and Lynn, Providence and Chapech, had their attorneys upon every committee, their orators in every debate, and their powerful lobby in every Congress. Was this what was contemplated in the organization of our federal system? Was it not sure to generate in the national legislature the fatal elements of distrust, and thus impair the unity and integrity of our constitutional government? Could we hope to continue a harmonious whole when the parts are in hopeless conflict? Once launched upon the troubled sea of partisan controversy, we must ride out the storm. The voyage has indeed been long, boisterous, and damaging. But we are safely in port once more; and it may well be asked, whether we are again ready to meet the dangers and the damages of another such political cruise? We think not.

If the tariff requires modification, let the work be done solely upon public considerations. In that case the question will belong exclusively to the patriotic representatives of an honest people—those who want no special advantages, and who ought not to be charged with special burdens. Those who look to local interests, and seek to secure for them peculiar advantages, may represent their constituents faithfully, but they do not worthily execute the trusts placed in their hands as members of the federal government. They may be guided by the will of those who elected them, but they are not guided by the constitution under which they take their seats in Congress. And is it not apparent that, in too many cases, local judgment is treated as paramount to the compact of Union? And is it not also apparent that, to the extent that this evil prevails, to that extent the seeds of estrangement and disunion have been scattered and rooted in the public mind of the nation?

THE GREAT FALLS APPRAISEMENT CASE.

The gentleman who furnished the substance of the following article requests us to say that he desires it to be stated that the object on the part of the representatives of the government in refusing to agree to a vacation of the verdict by consent was to have a decision of the Judge for the guidance of a future jury—if there be a future jury—and was so avowed to be by the counsel. And it should be more distinctly stated that the government's counsel maintained that the Virginia shore above the Falls never had any riparian rights, and that the compact of 1785 did not confer such rights.

The argument of this case was brought to a close yesterday—three lawyers having discussed it on each side. The discussion, said to have been a very able one, was on a motion by the United States, to set aside the verdict of the jury in August last—a jury called by itself to value the property proposed to be taken, whether land or materials, for the aqueduct.

The exceptions were very numerous, but were only insisted upon so far as they applied to some half-dozen points.

The first question was, whether the legislature of Maryland (responding to an application of the federal government for leave to purchase and hold property in the State, and for nothing more) had really, by design or accident, made a donation of the waters and water powers of the Potomac river to the United States for the uses of the aqueduct.

2d. Whether the legislature of Maryland possessed the power to convey legally to the United States the authority to condemn within Maryland any private property for public use, without the consent and against the protest of the individual proprietors—that is, for objects and in cases not already contemplated and provided for in the constitution.

3d. Whether a great water-power of a hundred feet fall can be held by an individual or a company in a state of present disuse without being subject to be taken for public use, and taken without any compensation at all, or at a compensation calculated by its actual improvement and productivity in a state of total disuse.

4th. Whether by the compact of 1785 between Maryland and Virginia the Virginia shore of the Potomac river is deprived of those riparian rights that attach to both shores of all other rivers lying within the jurisdiction of any of the States; and that in consequence, Virginia holders of the banks, as such, cannot in fact use a drop of the water, or water-power, for any purpose whatsoever, but are required to leave it to the Maryland shore, whether the government of the United States can take from that side of the river what water it wants—in

despite of the proprietors, by reason of anything in the Maryland law referred to.

6th. Whether the county court of Montgomery can settle questions of land title, on a motion to vacate a verdict for excess of damages, rendered by a jury of good names? No party appearing, or known, or heard of, to contest the right of the party, and the only party summoned by the government to meet its inquisition.

7th. Whether the owners of the Virginia side of the Great Falls, on which only the water-power ever was, or ever can be, used for manufacturing purposes, and on which it has been continuously used for more than seventy years, have been *de facto*, and still are, trespassers? It was held by the company that the title to both the shores of the river, from above the head to below the foot of the fall, belonged to said company, except a small strip on one side, utterly impracticable for any purpose of use or improvement. That the subject of its title had been by the government submitted to learned and able counsel, who had perfectly concurred in pronouncing the same without a flaw or shadow of doubt.

It was contended that the title was conceded by the government, in its own act of appointing the lawyers who gave that opinion, immediately afterwards, to attend as counsel for the government; which was agreed to.

It was claimed that the company were owners of the property for near twenty years before the aqueduct was ever heard of, and that, therefore, the statements in the newspapers about *surplusage* on the government, &c., were silly and idle suppositions, or base and infamous attempts to injure and prejudice private rights.

The Judge took the papers with him for the purpose of a thorough investigation of the case between this and the next spring term, when he will probably announce his opinion and decision. If he rejects the verdict on any ground, then there must be another jury, for the water can never be taken but on the valuation of a jury of the county of Montgomery.

It was also stated and proven, or admitted, that immediately after the inquisition in August last the agent of the company offered, verbally and in writing, to the counsel of the government and the Secretary of War to set the verdict aside by consent; which they declined doing.

The above account of the issues made at Rockville, we obtain from one of the counsel in the case.

The private parties were shown to have persistently petitioned (from the commencement of the work and before it) to have the question settled by regular condemnation by action or negotiation.

It is sincerely to be regretted that the upshot of this last trial may not be further law proceedings under the operation of a writ of injunction which may postpone the completion of the water-works.

ARIZONA.

The bill for the organization of the Territory of Arizona comes up as a special order of the day in the Senate on Monday. We trust it may receive the immediate attention it deserves. It will be recollected that last session the delegate from New Mexico, Mr. Otero, while admitting the necessity of a territorial government for Arizona, differed with Mr. Mowry, the delegate from Arizona, on the question of the northern boundary, upon the ground that he was not informed as to the wishes of the people of the Rio Grande. During the recess of Congress, Mr. Otero has been called upon by the unanimous voice of the people of the Rio Grande to unite his exertions with those of their delegate, Mr. Mowry, to procure for them a separate territorial government. Responding to this call upon him by the people, we learn that the delegate from New Mexico has withdrawn "the objections he urged last session, and is now acting in concert with the delegate from Arizona. The proposed Territory is admitted to be one of the most valuable of our possessions, already numbers a population of more than 10,000 souls, and is attracting rapidly a large and good emigration. The proposition to organize the Territory is simply this: to afford protection to our people—to protect the overland mail, daily threatened—and to restore upon our Mexican frontier the prestige of the American name, sadly tarnished during the past years of neglect.

REPRESENTATIVE LETCHER.—We protest as Virginians against the withdrawal of honest John Letcher from Congress until the 4th of March, when his term expires. Virginia wants his services at this time. Any democrat in this State who has read the President's message must desire the presence of Letcher in the House of Representatives when the important questions which it is to discuss are being considered. From the 4th of March to the 4th of Thursday in May is long enough for Letcher to put himself right on all issues which may be sprung upon him, however unexpected the opposition may be. With the most exalted opinion of the gallant democracy of the Tenth Legion, we must believe he cannot furnish a man who could fill the place of Letcher for the remainder of this session of Congress—*Nonnulli Southern Argus*.

GLEANED FROM THE MAILS.

The coinage of the New Orleans mint in November consisted of \$35,000 in gold and \$326,321 in silver. The deposits reached \$247,188.

Mr. Ullman, the proprietor and director of the New York Academy of Music, has tendered the splendid orchestra of Musard for a grand ball, to be given in Richmond, under the patronage of the ladies, for the benefit of the Mount Vernon Fund. The offer has been accepted, but no night has yet been fixed.

Four Presidents of the United States, viz: Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Tyler, were educated at William and Mary College. The Secret Society of the Phi Beta Kappa originated at this college about 1775. The affiliated Society of Harvard received its charter from that source. The original, however, was interrupted by the revolutionary war. It has been revived since 1850, and is now in active operation, with the old records restored to the society. They last passed into the hands of the Historical Society of Virginia, and were safely kept.

A lady—it is evident she is a lady, because she behaves like one—of Cynthia, Kentucky, who was divorced from her husband a short time ago, having heard that her late partner was in the habit of saying unkind things about her, called upon him at his store, talked to him severely, not to say profanely, threw Cayenne pepper into his nose and eyes, and administered some very distinct and separate whippings, the first with a cowhide, the second with a rope. The paper that relates these circumstances makes the astounding disclosure that "the parties are respectable." For this reason it gives no names.

A great many just and hard things have been said about "professional juries," but an incident occurred lately in a Cincinnati court which illustrates one point of merit possessed by this class. The judge had just charged the jury in a very important case, when, to the great astonishment of all present, a professional, who happened to be on, arose from his seat and begged to call the attention of his honor to a slight mistake he had made in his charge, and actually asked the jury to amend his position. Upon referring to his citations, it was found that the no small amusement of the spectators, that the jurymen were right and his honor was wrong; whereupon, with all due gravity, he informed the bench that he knew he was correct, as he had been charged at least forty times on the same point in the last four months, and could not be mistaken!

On the 13th September last a slave named "Little John" was arrested and taken by the State Deputy Marshall Love, of Columbus, by virtue of a warrant issued by United States Commissioner Chittenden, of the southern district of Ohio, at the instance of Anderson D. Jennings, the deputy agent of the owner, John D. Bacon, both residents of Mason county, Kentucky. The same day a mob of the citizens of Oberlin was raised to prevent the execution of the process by the marshal, and the negro was rescued at Wellington, a few miles from Oberlin. The citizens of the latter place held a glorification meeting, and determined to resist, for the future, any and every attempt to arrest a negro at Oberlin. Within a few days the United States grand jury at Cleveland, Ohio, have found true bills against thirty-seven of the ringleaders in this affair, including the Rev. Henry P. Fitch, professor in Oberlin College, the Rev. James M. Peck, formerly missionary to Jamaica, several theological students, five fugitive slaves, and thirty other citizens of all colors.

CONGRESSIONAL.

Thirty-Fifth Congress—Second Session.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1886.

The Senate was not in session to-day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. SMITH, of Tennessee, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the members of the House of Representatives twenty thousand copies of the message of the President of the United States, together with the accompanying documents.

Mr. KELSEY, of New York, thought that would open the President's message for debate, and for that reason he should object to the committee making their report.

The SPEAKER stated that the committee had a right to report at any time.

Mr. SMITH demanded the previous question; which was seconded; and, under the operation thereof, the resolution was adopted.

Mr. SMITH, from the same committee, reported the following resolution: which was agreed to.

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the members of the House of Representatives fifteen thousand copies of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances; also, ten thousand additional copies for the use of the Treasury Department.

PAYMENTS BY THE GOVERNMENT.

On motion of Mr. SCALES, of North Carolina, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to furnish this House with a statement of the different payments from the Treasury of the United States from the year 1840 to the year 1876, including the interest on the public debt, and the different kinds of currency, extraordinary, and the public debt, and specifying the items of each.

THE IMPEDIMENT OF JUDGE WATSON.

The House then resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary in the case of Judge J. W. Watson, judge of the district court of the United States for the district of Texas.

Mr. REAGAN, of Texas, reviewed the evidence at great length. Honorable gentlemen declared that in all the evidence there was no specific act on which they could lay their finger calling for the impeachment of Judge Watson.

It was not proved that a specific act had been committed by Judge Watson, but that he was impeached by the House of Representatives. It seemed to him that the evidence was sufficient to warrant his impeachment. He was either influenced by improper motives, or failed to discharge his duty as judge. Mr. R. had not concluded his review of the case when the hammer fell.

Mr. STUART, of Maryland, was in favor of an independent jury, State or national—and against clamor and prejudice from any quarter. It seemed to him that a great many strange circumstances were mixed up with this case, and as an individual may be governed by suggestions of that kind, he was liable to be led into erroneous conclusions. Upon the question of impeachment they all knew that there was a great deal of confusion and doubt. A civil officer of the government might be impeached for treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors; and if the House were called upon to send the case to the Senate, it must be for one of these reasons—for some official misconduct. He had not seen anything in the testimony or evidence of official misconduct authorizing him to come to that conclusion. He thought the House should not go outside of the testimony, and he denied the power of the House to send the case to the Senate merely from an impression that there should be further examination. It was his duty to examine the question for themselves. It was for the Senate to sit as judges, and they should not throw all the responsibility upon the Senate. Between the two resolutions reported he chose that against the impeachment.

Mr. CLARK, of New York, obtained the floor, but yielded for a moment to Mr. BRYAN, of Texas, who stated that he had seen the portion of the evidence which related to the fact that Judge Watson had been unable to make a report to the House, and that it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued.

Mr. HOUSTON, of Alabama, said it was his expectation that the discussion should be terminated to-day, but he was now satisfied that this could not be done. He should consult the temper of the House and endeavor to obtain a vote as early a day as possible. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a desire to close debate.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, suggested an extension of the time until Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, desired to know whether a motion to suspend the rules on Monday would override the consideration of this case.

Mr. CLARK inquired whether he was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER replied that he was.

Mr. CLARK then entered upon a discussion of the merits of the case. The committee had determined to investigate the facts without reference to the evidence of Judge Watson's general character, and with a single eye to the particular charges against him. The evidence of his general character, he believed, was not to be published, and it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a desire to close debate.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, suggested an extension of the time until Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, desired to know whether a motion to suspend the rules on Monday would override the consideration of this case.

Mr. CLARK inquired whether he was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER replied that he was.

Mr. CLARK then entered upon a discussion of the merits of the case. The committee had determined to investigate the facts without reference to the evidence of Judge Watson's general character, and with a single eye to the particular charges against him. The evidence of his general character, he believed, was not to be published, and it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a desire to close debate.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, suggested an extension of the time until Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, desired to know whether a motion to suspend the rules on Monday would override the consideration of this case.

Mr. CLARK inquired whether he was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER replied that he was.

Mr. CLARK then entered upon a discussion of the merits of the case. The committee had determined to investigate the facts without reference to the evidence of Judge Watson's general character, and with a single eye to the particular charges against him. The evidence of his general character, he believed, was not to be published, and it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a desire to close debate.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, suggested an extension of the time until Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, desired to know whether a motion to suspend the rules on Monday would override the consideration of this case.

Mr. CLARK inquired whether he was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER replied that he was.

Mr. CLARK then entered upon a discussion of the merits of the case. The committee had determined to investigate the facts without reference to the evidence of Judge Watson's general character, and with a single eye to the particular charges against him. The evidence of his general character, he believed, was not to be published, and it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a desire to close debate.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, suggested an extension of the time until Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, desired to know whether a motion to suspend the rules on Monday would override the consideration of this case.

Mr. CLARK inquired whether he was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER replied that he was.

Mr. CLARK then entered upon a discussion of the merits of the case. The committee had determined to investigate the facts without reference to the evidence of Judge Watson's general character, and with a single eye to the particular charges against him. The evidence of his general character, he believed, was not to be published, and it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a desire to close debate.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, suggested an extension of the time until Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, desired to know whether a motion to suspend the rules on Monday would override the consideration of this case.

Mr. CLARK inquired whether he was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER replied that he was.

Mr. CLARK then entered upon a discussion of the merits of the case. The committee had determined to investigate the facts without reference to the evidence of Judge Watson's general character, and with a single eye to the particular charges against him. The evidence of his general character, he believed, was not to be published, and it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a desire to close debate.

Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, suggested an extension of the time until Tuesday, at 3 o'clock.

Mr. WASHINGTON, of Illinois, desired to know whether a motion to suspend the rules on Monday would override the consideration of this case.

Mr. CLARK inquired whether he was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER replied that he was.

Mr. CLARK then entered upon a discussion of the merits of the case. The committee had determined to investigate the facts without reference to the evidence of Judge Watson's general character, and with a single eye to the particular charges against him. The evidence of his general character, he believed, was not to be published, and it would be necessary for him to reply to them. He desired to know whether the debate would be further continued. He would like, however, for the House to indicate some time at which the debate could be arrested.

Several MEMBERS. "Monday, at three o'clock."

Mr. HOUSTON. "I am willing to say Monday, or any other day, at three o'clock."

Mr. CRAIG, of North Carolina, said there were four members of the committee who still desired to speak, some of whom were not prepared to speak to-day.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will not press a vote until the House shall give evidence of a